

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE**

TELCORDIA TECHNOLOGIES, INC.,)

Plaintiff/Counterclaim Defendant,)

v.)

CISCO SYSTEMS, INC.,)

Defendant/Counterclaim Plaintiff.)

Civil Action No. 04-876-GMS

VERDICT FORM

REDACTED

We, the jury, unanimously find as follows:

QUESTION 1: INFRINGEMENT

Question No. 1(a): Direct Infringement Of '763 Patent

Do you find that Telcordia has proven, by a preponderance of the evidence, that Cisco has directly infringed any of the following claims of U.S. Patent No. 4,835,763?

Check YES (for Telcordia) or NO (for Cisco) for each claim:

	YES	NO
Claim 1	✓	
Claim 2	✓	
Claim 7	✓	
Claim 8	✓	

Question No. 1(b): Indirect Infringement Of '763 Patent

Do you find that Telcordia has proven, by a preponderance of the evidence, that Cisco has indirectly infringed (either by inducing or contributing to infringement of) any of the following claims of U.S. Patent No. 4,835,763?

Check YES (for Telcordia) or NO (for Cisco) for each claim:

	YES	NO
Claim 1	✓	
Claim 2	✓	
Claim 7	✓	
Claim 8	✓	

Question No. 1(c): Direct Infringement Of '633 Patent

Do you find that Telcordia has proven, by a preponderance of the evidence, that Cisco has directly infringed any of the following claims of U.S. Patent No. Re. 36,633?

Check YES (for Telcordia) or NO (for Cisco) for each claim:

	YES	NO
Claim 11	✓	
Claim 33	✓	

Question No. 1(d): Indirect Infringement Of '633 Patent

Do you find that Telcordia has proven, by a preponderance of the evidence, that Cisco has indirectly infringed (either by inducing or contributing to infringement of) any of the following claims of U.S. Patent No. Re. 36,633?

Check YES (for Telcordia) or NO (for Cisco) for each claim:

	YES	NO
Claim 11	✓	
Claim 33	✓	

PLEASE PROCEED TO QUESTION 2

QUESTION 2: INVALIDITY**Question No. 2(a): Invalidity Of '763 Patent**

Has Cisco proven, by clear and convincing evidence, that any of the following claims of Telcordia's U.S. Patent No. 4,835,763 is invalid?

Check YES (for Cisco) or NO (for Telcordia) for each claim:

	YES	NO
Claim 1		✓
Claim 2		✓
Claim 7		✓
Claim 8		✓

Question No. 2(b): Invalidity Of '633 Patent

Has Cisco proven, by clear and convincing evidence, that any of the following claims of Telcordia's U.S. Patent No. Re. 36,633 is invalid?

Check YES (for Cisco) or NO (for Telcordia) for each claim:

	YES	NO
Claim 11		✓
Claim 33		✓

Question No. 2(c): Invalidity Of '306 Patent

Has Cisco proven, by clear and convincing evidence, that any of the following claims of Telcordia's U.S. Patent No. 4,893,306 is invalid?

Check YES (for Cisco) or NO (for Telcordia) for each claim:

	YES	NO
Claim 1		✓
Claim 3		✓
Claim 4		✓

PLEASE PROCEED TO QUESTION 3

QUESTION 3: UNENFORCEABILITY

Question No. 3(a): Inequitable Conduct Concerning '763 Patent

Has Cisco proven, by clear and convincing evidence, that U.S. Patent No. 4,835,763 is unenforceable due to inequitable conduct?

Answer YES (for Cisco) or NO (for Telcordia): No

Question No. 3(b): Inequitable Conduct Concerning '633 Patent

Has Cisco proven, by clear and convincing evidence, that U.S. Patent No. Re. 36,633 is unenforceable due to inequitable conduct?

Answer YES (for Cisco) or NO (for Telcordia): No

Question No. 3(c): Equitable Estoppel Concerning '633 Patent

Has Cisco proven, by a preponderance of the evidence, that Telcordia's patent infringement claims as to U.S. Patent No. Re. 36,633 are barred by the doctrine of equitable estoppel?

Answer YES (for Cisco) or NO (for Telcordia): No

Question No. 3(d): Inequitable Conduct Concerning '306 Patent

Has Cisco proven, by clear and convincing evidence, that U.S. Patent No. 4,893,306 is unenforceable due to inequitable conduct?

Answer YES (for Cisco) or NO (for Telcordia): No

ONLY ANSWER QUESTIONS 4, 5, AND 6 IF YOU HAVE FOUND THAT CISCO HAS INFRINGED A VALID AND ENFORCEABLE CLAIM. OTHERWISE YOU ARE COMPLETED, AND THE FOREPERSON SHOULD PLEASE SIGN ON THE SIGNATURE BLOCK BELOW.

QUESTION 4: WILLFULNESS

Question No. 4(a): Willful Infringement Of '763 Patent

Has Telcordia proven, by clear and convincing evidence, that Cisco's infringement of any one of claims 1, 2, 7, or 8 of Telcordia's U.S. Patent No. 4,835,763 was willful?

Answer YES (for Telcordia) or NO (for Cisco): YES

Question No. 4(b): Willful Infringement Of '633 Patent

Has Telcordia proven, by clear and convincing evidence, that Cisco's infringement of any one of claims 11 or 33 of Telcordia's U.S. Patent No. Re. 36,633 was willful?

Answer YES (for Telcordia) or NO (for Cisco): YES

QUESTION 5: LACHES

Has Cisco proven, by a preponderance of the evidence, that Telcordia has unreasonably and inexcusably delayed in bringing its claims against Cisco, such that laches applies? For each patent, check YES (for Cisco) or NO (for Telcordia):

	YES	NO
'763 Patent		✓
'633 Patent		✓

If you find that laches applies as to the '763 patent, then Telcordia is not entitled to damages prior to June 14, 2005 for any infringement of the '763 patent; and if you find that laches applies as to the '633 patent, then Telcordia is not entitled to damages prior July 16, 2004 for any infringement of the '633 patent.

QUESTION 6: MONETARY DAMAGES

If you have found any claim of Telcordia U.S. Patent No. 4,835,763 or U.S. Patent No. Re. 36,633 to be both valid and infringed by Cisco, please identify the amount of monetary damages that will compensate Telcordia for Cisco's infringement.

\$ 6,500,000 (6.5 MIL)

Printed Name
Jury Foreperson